



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,508	10/14/2003	Gregory A. Hubbard	GP-304193	3535
7590	10/19/2005		EXAMINER	
Leslie Hodges General Motors Corporation, Legal Staff Mail Code: 482-C23-B21 P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			ARTHUR JEANGLAUME, GERTRUDE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	
DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/686,508	HUBBARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude	3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeffler et al (6,154,701) in view of Yamaguchi et al (US 2002/0062183). Loeffler et al (701) discloses a method and device for controlling the drive train of motor vehicle. The drive train, according to Loeffler et al, includes an engine (101) and a transmission (106). According to Loeffler et al, as set forth in columns 2 and 3, a set of operating region for the transmission (i.e., an output operating region and an input operating) is defined or pre-given. Furthermore, according to Loeffler et al, there is provided, for points of operation within the output operating region of interest, determining preferred operating points within the input operating region. Loeffler et al further disclose defining an operating space for the powertrain in transmission input speed, transmission input torque, transmission output speed and transmission output torque. See column 4. However, while Loeffler et al discloses determining the preferred operating points while considering several criteria (e.g., total efficiency of the drive train

of the vehicle), Loeffler et al does not particularly teach that the preferred operating points within the input region are determined as a function of preselected losses within the powertrain. Yamaguchi et al, on the other hand, discloses a control system for hybrid vehicle having a hybrid powertrain including an electric motor (103) and a battery (1 12). The vehicle powertrain system also includes an engine (101) and a transmission (104). See, for example, figure 28. Yamaguchi et al discloses determining operating points as a function of preselected losses within the powertrain. See pages 6, 12, 13 and 14. Yamaguchi et al also discloses determining at least one operating region for a region within the operating space corresponding to system operation as zero battery power. See figures 3-4 and 12-13. See also figures 34-38, page 12. The preselected losses (considered as minimizing an aggregate system loss), according to Yamaguchi et al, are selected from the group consisting of engine losses, transmission losses, motor losses and battery losses and combinations thereof. See pages 13 and 14. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to modify the drivetrain control of Loeffler et al by incorporating the features from the control system for hybrid vehicle of Yamaguchi et al because such modification, as suggested by Yamaguchi et al (page 1) would improve the efficiency of the system.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 14, 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 6-9 are allowed.

The prior art do not particularly teach, in combination with the other features, determining a first set of preferred operating points corresponding to unconstrained battery usage and second set of preferred operating points corresponding to fully constrained use. The prior art also fails to teach mapping valid combinations of input operating points within the input operating region and output operating points within the operating region to a measure of powertrain system losses as the valid combinations and, for operating points within the operating region, selecting input operating points within the input operating region from mapped valid combinations corresponding to predetermined criteria.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

REMARKS

In response to Applicant's representative arguments filed on 7/19/05, Applicant's representative argues on page 11 of response that the prior art Loeffler et al. do not teach minimizing an aggregate system loss in determining preferred operating points within the input operating region. However, the office action points that the Yamaguchi et al. prior art discloses determining operating points as a function of preselected losses (minimizing aggregate losses) within the powertrain . See pages 6, 12, 13, 14. Besides, in Applicant's response, on page 11, Applicant acknowledge that one skilled in the art

recognizes that a maximum total drivetrain efficiency term (Geta) corresponds to a minimum aggregate system loss. Applicant's representative argues that Loeffler et al. and Yamaguchi et al. alone or in combination, do not teach determining at least one operating region in transmission input speed (Ni), output speed (No) and output torque (To) corresponding to minimum aggregate system power losses wherein Ni within said determined operating region represents preferred input operating points. However, in the office action it is pointed that the supplement limitations are taught by Yamaguchi et al. see pages 13, 14; figures 3-4, 12-13.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude whose telephone number is (571) 272-6954. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gertrude A. Jeanglaude
GERTRUDE A. JEANGLAUDE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

GAJ

GAJ

October 16, 2005